

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-12 are pending in the present Application. Claims 2-7 and 9 have been canceled, Claim 1 has been amended, no claims have been added, and Claims 10-12 remain withdrawn, leaving Claim 1 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment.

Allowability of Claims/Objections to Claims/ Amendments to Claims

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in Claim 9, which is objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As seen in the amended claims above, Claim 9 has accordingly been rewritten in independent form per the Examiner's suggestion by including the limitations of Claim 9, canceled herewith, into Claim 1. In addition, Claims 2-7 have been canceled. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments, and no further search should be necessary.

As the amendments to Claim 1 and cancellations of claims 2-7 and 9 are carried out per the Examiner's suggestion of form in the present Office Action dated November 14, 2008, the amendments should be enterable as an amendment after final under 37 C.F.R. 1.116(b)(1), without need for a request for continued examination.

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over *Organometallics*, 2002, pp. 3873-3883 (“van der Slot”) in view of Billig et. al., *Kirk-Othmer Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology*, 1996, pp 1-17; the *Oxo Process* (“Billig”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the above amendments to Claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 9, canceled herewith. As the Examiner has not rejected Claim 9 over the combination of Van der Slot and Billig, and has indicated that the subject matter of Claim 9 is allowable if rewritten in independent form, Claim 1, so amended, should now be allowable.

Claims 2-7, also rejected over the combination of Van der Slot and Billig, have been canceled, and hence the rejection of these claims is now moot.

Therefore, the combination of van der Slot and Billig does not render Claim 1 unpatentable, and Claim 1 should be allowable in view of the above amendments.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Dana A. Gronbeck/
Dana A. Gronbeck
Registration No. 55,226
Confirmation No. 7001
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street, 22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413

Date: January 12, 2009